

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

AARON K. DANIELS,

Case No. 3:15-cv-00387-MMD-VPC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

GREG COX, et al.,

Defendants.

This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a state prisoner. On January 20, 2016, this Court issued an order dismissing the complaint with leave to amend and directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty (30) days. (Dkt no. 4 at 11-12). On February 8, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion for an additional thirty (30) days to amend his complaint. (Dkt no. 7.) The thirty-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of

1 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure
2 to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address);
3 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to
4 comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
5 (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

6 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to
7 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several
8 factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need
9 to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy
10 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
11 alternatives. *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*,
12 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

13 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in
14 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,
15 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs
16 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of
17 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.
18 See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor —
19 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits — is greatly outweighed by the
20 factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that
21 his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of
22 alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33;
23 *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended
24 complaint within thirty (30) days expressly stated: "It is further ordered that if Plaintiff
25 fails to file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies outlined in this order, this
26 action will be dismissed with prejudice." (Dkt. no. 4 at 12.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate
27 warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file
28 an amended complaint within thirty (30) days.

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
2 Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this Court's January
3 20, 2016, and February 8, 2016, orders.

4 It is further ordered that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (dkt. no. 1) is
5 denied as moot.

6 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's motion to extend limitations of plaintiff's photo
7 copy work account (dkt no. 3) is denied as moot.

8 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

9 DATED THIS 1st day of April 2016.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE